

On the densities of rational multiples

Vilius Stakėnas
 Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics
 Vilnius University
 email: vilius.stakenas@mif.vu.lt

Abstract

For two subsets of natural numbers $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ define the set of rational numbers $\mathcal{M}(A, B)$ with the elements represented by m/n , where m, n are coprime, m is divisible by some $a \in A$ and n by some $b \in B$, respectively. Let I be some interval of positive real numbers and $\mathcal{F}_x^I$ denotes the set of rational numbers $m/n \in I$, such that m, n are coprime and $n \leq x$. The analogue to the Erdős-Davenport theorem about multiples is proved: under some constraints on I the limits $\sum \{\frac{1}{mn} : \frac{m}{n} \in \mathcal{F}_x^I \cap \mathcal{M}(A, B)\} / \sum \{\frac{1}{mn} : \frac{m}{n} \in \mathcal{F}_x^I\}$ exist for all subsets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$.

1 INTRODUCTION

For a subset A of natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$ and $x > 1$ denote

$$\nu_x^0(A) = \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \in A \cap [1; x]} 1, \quad \nu_x^1(A) = \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{n \in A \cap [1; x]} \frac{1}{n}.$$

The lower and upper limits as $x \rightarrow \infty$ will be denoted by $\underline{\nu}^r(A), \overline{\nu}^r(A)$ ($r = 0, 1$); the value of the limit if it exists by $\nu^r(A)$, respectively.

It follows from the chain of inequalities

$$\underline{\nu}^0(A) \leq \underline{\nu}^1(A) \leq \overline{\nu}^1(A) \leq \overline{\nu}^0(A)$$

that the existence of $\nu^0(A)$ implies the existence of $\nu^1(A)$. If $\nu^0(A)$ exists, we say that A possesses asymptotic density, and if $\nu^1(A)$ exists, A possesses logarithmic density. Even the subsets A of apparently simple structure may not possess asymptotic density.

Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}$. The set of natural numbers divisible by some $a \in A$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}(A)$, i.e. $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is the set of multiples of A .

A.S. Besicovitch gave an example of A such that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ does not possess asymptotic density, see [1]. In 1937 H. Davenport and P. Erdős proved that every set of multiples have logarithmic density. Their original proof in [2] is based on Tauberian theorems, see also [6], Theorem 02. The direct and elementary proof of this theorem was provided by the authors in [3], it can be found also in the monograph of H. Halberstam and K.F. Roth, [5]. We formulate the Erdős-Davenport theorem in the form, which results from the arguments in [5].

Theorem 1. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $A_N = A \cap [1; N]$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\nu^1(\mathcal{M}(A_N)), \nu^1(\mathcal{M}(A))$ exist, and*

$$\nu^1(\mathcal{M}(A)) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \nu^1(\mathcal{M}(A_N)). \quad (1)$$

The main aim of this paper is to investigate the density questions related to the sets of multiples of rational numbers.

Let $\mathbb{Q}^+$ be the set of positive rational numbers. For the natural numbers m, n we denote as usually by (m, n) their greatest common divisor. If $(m, n) = 1$, i.e. the numbers are coprime, we write $m \perp n$ (suggestion of R.L. Graham, D.E. Knuth and O. Potashnik, see [4], p.115). For the rational numbers $r \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ we shall always use the unique representation $r = m/n, m, n \in \mathbb{N}, m \perp n$.

For two subsets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the set of multiples in $\mathbb{Q}^+$ by

$$\mathcal{M}(A, B|q) = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} : m \in \mathcal{M}(A), n \in \mathcal{M}(B), mn \perp q \right\}.$$

If $q = 1$ we write $\mathcal{M}(A, B)$ instead of $\mathcal{M}(A, B|1)$.

Let $I_x = (\lambda_1(x), \lambda_2(x))$ be some system of intervals, $I_x \subset (0; +\infty), x \geq 1$. We shall write in the following briefly $I = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ and introduce the sets of rational numbers

$$\mathcal{F}_x^I = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} : \frac{m}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}^+, n \leq x \right\} \cap I.$$

Let $R \subset \mathbb{Q}^+$ and $r_1, r_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. Then if $\mathcal{F}_x^I \neq \emptyset$, we denote

$$S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(R) = \sum_{m/n \in \mathcal{F}_x^I \cap R} m^{-r_1} n^{-r_2}, \quad \nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(R) = \frac{S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(R)}{S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{F}_x^I)}.$$

If the limit of $\nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(R)$ exists for $R \subset \mathbb{Q}^+$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, it will be denoted by $\nu^{r_1 r_2}(R)$, and the lower and upper limits by $\underline{\nu}^{r_1 r_2}(R), \overline{\nu}^{r_1 r_2}(R)$, respectively.

We investigate the limit behaviour of $\nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q))$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ under some conditions imposed on λ_i . In the case of unit interval $I = (0, 1)$ related problems were considered in authors paper [9].

2 OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

If interval $I = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ does not depend on x , the inequalities of type (1) can be proved.

Theorem 2. *Let the interval $I = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ be fixed. Then for an arbitrary $A \subset \mathbb{N}$*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\nu}^{00}(A) &\leq \underline{\nu}^{01}(A) \leq \overline{\nu}^{01}(A) \leq \overline{\nu}^{00}(A), \\ \underline{\nu}^{10}(A) &\leq \underline{\nu}^{11}(A) \leq \overline{\nu}^{11}(A) \leq \overline{\nu}^{10}(A). \end{aligned}$$

If A, B are finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ the following statement holds.

Theorem 3. *Let $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ satisfy the following conditions:*

if $\lambda_1 = 0$, then $\lambda_2 > x^{-c}$ for some $0 < c < 1$;

if $\lambda_1 > 0$, then $\lambda_1 \log(\lambda_2/\lambda_1) \log x \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Then for finite sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ all densities $\nu^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q))$ exist and are equal.

Note that if $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)/\lambda_1$ remains bounded, the constraints on λ_i are equivalent to requirement $(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \cdot \log x \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

It is possible to prove under appropriate conditions on λ_i this statement for the sets satisfying

$$\sum_{d \in A \cup B} \frac{1}{d} < \infty,$$

but we shall not pursue this question.

The inequality for densities in the following theorem should be compared to Heilbronn-Rohrbach inequality proved in [7], [8]; see also [6].

Theorem 4. *Let the sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ be finite and satisfy the following conditions: $a \perp b$ for all $a \in A, b \in B$; if $a_1, a_2 \in A, b_1, b_2 \in B$, then $a_1 \perp a_2/(a_1, a_2), b_1 \perp b_2/(b_1, b_2)$. Let $\nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q))$ denote the common value of densities from Theorem 3. Then the following inequality holds:*

$$1 - \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)) \geq \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right) \cdot \prod_{c \in A \cup B} \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \prod_{p|c} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)\right).$$

The sets satisfying conditions of Theorem 4 can be constructed as follows. Let $r_1, r_2, \dots$ be an arbitrary sequence of coprime integers. If $a_j = \prod_{k \in I_j} r_k$, where I_j is some finite subset of naturals then, obviously, $a_i \perp a_j/(a_j, a_i)$ for all pairs i, j .

The main result of the paper is an analogue of Erdős-Davenport theorem for the sets of rational multiples.

Theorem 5. *Let for the intervals $I = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ the following conditions be satisfied:
if $\lambda_1 = 0$ then $\lambda_2 x \rightarrow \infty$ and $\log x / \log(\lambda_2 x) < c_1$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ with some $c_1 > 0$;
if $\lambda_1 > 0$ then with some positive constants c_2, c_3*

$$\frac{c_2}{\log(\lambda_2 + 2)} < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < x^{c_3}, \quad \frac{1}{\log(\lambda_2 + 2)} \cdot \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \cdot \log x \rightarrow \infty, \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then for arbitrary $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ the limit

$$\nu^{11}(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \nu_x^{11}(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q))$$

exists.

Let $\lambda_1 > c(c > 0)$ and λ_2 be bounded. Then the conditions of Theorem 5 for λ_i can be reduced to requirement

$$(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \cdot \log x \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

3 PROOFS

Let q_0, q_1, q_2 be some coprime natural numbers and

$$\mathbb{Q}_{q_0, q_1, q_2} = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}^+, mn \perp q_0, mq_1 \perp nq_2 \right\}. \quad (2)$$

We investigate the asymptotical behaviour of the sums $S_{x, I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0, q_1, q_2})$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Methods being used are elementary, the remainder terms in the asymptotics depend on q_i .

Lemma. *Let for the coprime integers q_0, q_1, q_2*

$$\Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) = \prod_{p|q_0} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right) \prod_{p|q_1 q_2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right).$$

Then the following asymptotics hold

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{S_{x, I}^{00}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0, q_1, q_2})}{\Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2)} &= \frac{3}{\pi^2} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) x^2 \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} + \frac{\log x}{(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x}\right) \right\}, \\ \frac{S_{x, I}^{01}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0, q_1, q_2})}{\Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2)} &= \frac{6}{\pi^2} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) x \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} + \frac{\log^2 x}{(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x}\right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\lambda_1 > 0$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{S_{x,I}^{10}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0,q_1,q_2})}{\Pi(q_0,q_1,q_2)} &= \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) x \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} + \frac{\log^2 x}{\lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)x}\right) \right\}, \\ \frac{S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0,q_1,q_2})}{\Pi(q_0,q_1,q_2)} &= \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \log x \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \log x}\right) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

In the case $\lambda_1 = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{S_{x,I}^{10}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0,q_1,q_2})}{\Pi(q_0,q_1,q_2)} &= \frac{6}{\pi^2} x \log(\lambda_2 x) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\lambda_2 x)} + \frac{\log x}{x}\right) \right\}, \\ \frac{S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0,q_1,q_2})}{\Pi(q_0,q_1,q_2)} &= \begin{cases} \frac{3}{\pi^2} \log^2(\lambda_2 x) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{\log^2(\lambda_2 x)}\right) \right\}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{x} < \lambda_2 \leq 1, \\ \frac{3}{\pi^2} \log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2^2 x) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log(\lambda_2 x)}{\log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2^2 x)}\right) \right\}, & \text{if } \lambda_2 > 1. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

The functions in O-signs of the Lemma are different. It is easily seen, that if $\lambda_1 = 0$, then the condition $x^{-c} < \lambda_2$ with some $0 < c < 1$ is sufficient for all functions in O-signs related to the case $\lambda_1 = 0$ to be vanishing.

Consider now the case $\lambda_1 > 0$. The function

$$f(u) = u - c \log\left(1 + \frac{u}{c}\right), \quad u \geq 0, \quad c > 0,$$

is not decreasing, hence

$$\lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) = \lambda_1 \log\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{\lambda_1}\right) \leq \lambda_2 - \lambda_1.$$

It follows from this, that under condition

$$\lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \frac{x}{\log^2 x} \rightarrow \infty, \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

all functions in O-signs of $S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0,q_1,q_2})$, with $r_1 + r_2 < 2$, are vanishing. We include $S_{x,I}^{11}$ if we use the stronger requirement

$$\lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \log x \rightarrow \infty, \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

If $q_0 = q_1 = q_2 = 1$, then

$$S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{1,1,1}) = S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}^+) = \sum \left\{ m^{-r_1} n^{-r_2} : \frac{m}{n} \in \mathcal{F}_x^I \right\}.$$

The following Corollary follows easily from the Lemma.

Corollary. *Let λ_i fulfill the following conditions*

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{if } \lambda_1 = 0 \text{ then } x^{-c} < \lambda_2 \text{ with some } 0 < c < 1; \\ &\text{if } \lambda_1 > 0 \text{ then } \lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \log x \rightarrow \infty, \quad x \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Then for all r_1, r_2 and fixed coprime numbers q_0, q_1, q_2

$$\frac{S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0,q_1,q_2})}{S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}^+)} \rightarrow \Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. We abbreviate the notation as $S^{r_1 r_2} = S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{q_0, q_1, q_2})$ and start with the expression

$$S^{r_1 r_2} = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} n^{-r_2} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 n < m < \lambda_2 n \\ m \perp n q_0 q_2}} m^{-r_1}.$$

With the Möbius function $\mu(n)$ we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S^{r_1 r_2} &= \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} n^{-r_2} \sum_{\lambda_1 n < m < \lambda_2 n} m^{-r_1} \sum_{d|(m, n q_0 q_2)} \mu(d) = \sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d|n q_0 q_2}} n^{-r_2} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1 n < m < \lambda_2 n \\ d|m}} m^{-r_1} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \mu(d) d^{-r_1} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2)|n}} n^{-r_2} \sum_{\lambda_1 \frac{n}{d} < m < \lambda_2 \frac{n}{d}} m^{-r_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

For the last sum over m we shall use the following equalities

$$\sum_{\lambda_1 \frac{n}{d} < m < \lambda_2 \frac{n}{d}} m^{-r_1} = \begin{cases} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \frac{n}{d} + \theta_{n,d}, & \text{if } r_1 = 0, \\ \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) + \theta_{n,d} \frac{d}{\lambda_1 n}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 > 0, r_1 = 1, \\ \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2 n}{d}\right) + \theta_{n,d}, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = 0, r_1 = 1, \text{ and } \frac{\lambda_2 n}{d} > 1, \end{cases}$$

where $\theta_{n,d}$ are bounded by some absolute constant.

Consider the case $r_1 = r_2 = 0$ first. Then

$$S^{00} = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2)|n}} n + O\left(\sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \mu^2(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2)|n}} 1\right). \quad (4)$$

Let S_1^{00} stands for the main term in (4). Using the divisibility property $d/(d, q_0 q_2)|n$ and the asymptotics

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq u \\ n \perp q}} n = \frac{1}{2} u^2 \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + O(u),$$

we rewrite the main term of S^{00} as

$$S_1^{00} = \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) x^2 \prod_{p|q_0 q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} (d, q_0 q_2) \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O((\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) x \log x). \quad (5)$$

Note that $d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1$ is equivalent to $d \perp q_1$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} (d, q_0 q_2) \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} &= \sum_{d \perp q_1} (d, q_0 q_2) \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O\left(q_0 q_2 \sum_{d > x q_0 q_1} \frac{1}{d^2}\right) \\ &= \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right) \prod_{p|q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1} \prod_{p|q_0 q_2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Setting this in (5) one gets

$$S_1^{00} = \frac{3}{\pi^2} (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) x^2 \Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) + O((\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) x \log x).$$

For the remainder term in (4) we use the bound

$$\sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \mu^2(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} 1 \leq \sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \mu^2(d) \sum_{n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2)/d} 1 = O(x \log x).$$

Hence putting all together we obtain

$$S^{00} = \frac{3}{\pi^2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x^2\Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2)\left\{1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} + \frac{\log x}{(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x}\right)\right\}.$$

Consider now the case $r_1 = 0, r_2 = 1$. Then instead of (4) we have

$$S^{01} = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} 1 + O\left(\sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \mu^2(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n}\right). \quad (6)$$

Let S_1^{01} denote the main term in (6). Using

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq u \\ n \perp q}} 1 = u \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + O(1)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^{01} &= (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x \prod_{p|q_0 q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} (d, q_0 q_2) \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + O((\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \log x) \\ &= \frac{6}{\pi^2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x\Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) + O((\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \log x). \end{aligned}$$

For the remainder term in (6) use the obvious bound

$$\sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \mu^2(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n} \leq \sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} (d, q_0 q_2) \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} = O(\log^2 x).$$

Hence the asymptotics

$$S^{01} = \frac{6}{\pi^2}(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x\Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2)\left\{1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} + \frac{\log^2 x}{(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)x}\right)\right\}.$$

is established.

Suppose now that $r_1 = 1, r_2 = 0$. From (3) one gets

$$S^{10} = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \sum_{\lambda_1 \frac{n}{d} < m < \lambda_2 \frac{n}{d}} \frac{1}{m}.$$

Let first $\lambda_1 > 0$. Then

$$S^{10} = \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \mu^2(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Expression for S^{10} differs from that one in (6) in term involving λ_i only. Hence, in the same way as above we get

$$S^{10} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) x \Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x} + \frac{\log^2 x}{\lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) x}\right) \right\}.$$

Let now $\lambda_1 = 0$. Then

$$S^{10} = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2 n}{d}\right) + O\left(\sum_{d \leq x q_0 q_1} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} 1\right).$$

The remainder term does not exceed

$$x \sum_d (d, q_0 q_2) \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d^2} = O(x).$$

Using the divisibility condition $d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n$ we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S^{10} &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2)/d \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2 n}{(d, q_0 q_2)}\right) + O(x) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2)/d \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \log(\lambda_2 n) \\ &- \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \log(d, q_0 q_2) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2)/d \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} 1 + O(x). \end{aligned}$$

The second minus term is $O(x)$, hence

$$S^{10} = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2)/d \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \log(\lambda_2 n) + O(x). \quad (7)$$

Using

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq u \\ n \perp q}} 1 = u \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + O(1)$$

and integrating by parts one derives for $c > 0$ easily

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq u \\ n \perp q}} \log(cn) = u \log(cu) \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + O(u + |\log(cu)|), \quad \text{as } u \rightarrow \infty.$$

Using this in (7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} S^{10} &= \prod_{p|q_0 q_2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) x \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) \log\left(\lambda_2 x \frac{(d, q_0 q_2)}{d}\right) \\ &+ O\left(x + x \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) + \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d} \left| \log\left(\lambda_2 x \frac{(d, q_0 q_2)}{d}\right) \right| \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen that the remainder term can be reduced to $O(x + \log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2 x) + \log^2 x) = O(x + \log x \log(\lambda_2 x^2))$. Using additivity property for the logarithm in the first sum we split the

main term of S^{10} into two parts and the second will be $O(x)$. Hence

$$S^{10} = \prod_{p|q_0 q_2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) x \log(\lambda_2 x) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) + O(x + \log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2 x^2)).$$

The remaining sum was calculated above, then simplifying the remainder terms one gets

$$S^{10} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) x \log(\lambda_2 x) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\lambda_2 x)} + \frac{\log x}{x}\right) \right\}.$$

With $r_1 = r_2 = 1$ we have

$$S^{11} = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\lambda_1 \frac{n}{d} < m < \lambda_2 \frac{n}{d}} \frac{1}{m}.$$

If $\lambda_1 > 0$ this reduces to

$$S^{11} = \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d} \cdot d \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n^2}\right).$$

The sum over n in the remainder term is $O(d^{-2})$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} S^{11} &= \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n} + O(\lambda_1^{-1}) \\ &= \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_1) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2)/d \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{1}{n} + O(\lambda_1^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Using the asymptotics

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq u \\ n \perp q}} \frac{1}{n} = \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \log u + O(1),$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned} S^{11} &= \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \prod_{p|q_0 q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) \log\left(x \cdot \frac{(d, q_0 q_2)}{d}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)\right) \\ &= \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \prod_{p|q_0 q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \log x \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) + O\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the sum over d as above we arrive finally to

$$S^{11} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) \log x \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right) \log x}\right) \right\}.$$

Consider now the case $\lambda_1 = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} S^{11} &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{d/\lambda_2 < n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m < \lambda_2 \frac{n}{d}} \frac{1}{m} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{d/\lambda_2 < n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n} \log\left(\frac{\lambda_2 n}{d}\right) + O\left(\sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu^2(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n}} \frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the divisibility condition $d/(d, q_0 q_2) | n$ we reduce the term in O-sign to $O(\log x)$ and simplify the expression as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S^{11} &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) \sum_{\substack{(d, q_0 q_2) / \lambda_2 < n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2) / d \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2 n}{(d, q_0 q_2)} \right) + O(\log x) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) \sum_{\substack{(d, q_0 q_2) / \lambda_2 < n \leq x(d, q_0 q_2) / d \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\log(\lambda_2 n)}{n} + O(\log x). \end{aligned}$$

Extending the sum over n to the range $1/\lambda_2 < n \leq x$ we introduce the error term $O(\log x + \log(\lambda_2 x))$. Hence

$$S^{11} = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x q_0 q_1 \\ d/(d, q_0 q_2) \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} (d, q_0 q_2) \sum_{\substack{1/\lambda_2 < n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\log(\lambda_2 n)}{n} + O(\log x + \log(\lambda_2 x)).$$

The main term is expressed as the product of two sums, the first one equals to

$$\frac{6}{\pi^2} \Pi(q_0, q_1, q_2) \prod_{p|q_0 q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} + O(x^{-1}).$$

The second sum of the main term can be calculated by partial integration, the final result would be

$$\sum_{\substack{1/\lambda_2 < n \leq x \\ n \perp q_0 q_1}} \frac{\log(\lambda_2 n)}{n} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \prod_{p|q_0 q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) (\log x + \log \lambda_2)^2 + O(1), & \text{as } \lambda_2 < 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} \prod_{p|q_0 q_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) (\log^2 x + 2 \log \lambda_2 \log x) + O(\log(\lambda_2 + 1)), & \text{as } \lambda_2 \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

If we write $(\log x + \log \lambda_2)^2 = \log^2(\lambda_2 x)$ and $(\log^2 x + 2 \log \lambda_2 \log x) = \log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2^2 x)$, then after manipulating with the remainder terms we arrive to the following expressions

$$S^{11} = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{\pi^2} \log^2(\lambda_2 x) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{\log^2(\lambda_2 x)}\right) \right\}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{x} < \lambda_2 \leq 1, \\ \frac{3}{\pi^2} \log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2^2 x) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{\log(\lambda_2 x)}{\log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2^2 x)}\right) \right\}, & \text{if } \lambda_2 > 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that the remainder term for $\lambda_2 > x^{-c}$, where $0 < c < 1$, is $O(\log^{-1} x)$. The Lemma is proved.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let us start with the first chain of inequalities. Because of the interval I is fixed

$$S_{x,I}^{00}(\mathbb{Q}^+) \sim \frac{3}{\pi^2} |I| x^2, \quad S_{x,I}^{01}(\mathbb{Q}^+) \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} |I| x, \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $|I| = \lambda_2 - \lambda_1$. For an arbitrary subset $A \subset \mathbb{Q}^+$ we have

$$S_{x,I}^{01}(A) = \int_{1-}^x \frac{1}{t} dS_{t,I}^{00}(A) = \frac{S_{x,I}^{00}(A)}{x} + \int_{1-}^x \frac{S_{t,I}^{00}(A)}{t^2} dt. \quad (8)$$

For an arbitrary fixed $\epsilon > 0$ we shall have

$$S_{t,I}^{00}(A) \leq (\overline{v}^{00}(A) + \epsilon) \frac{3}{\pi^2} |I| t^2$$

as $t \geq t_0$. From this observation and (8) we derive

$$S_{x,I}^{00}(A) \leq (\overline{v}^{00}(A) + \epsilon) \frac{6}{\pi^2} |I| x + C,$$

with some $C > 0$. Then, consequently, $\overline{\nu}^{01}(A) \leq \overline{\nu}^{00}(A)$. The inequality for lower limits follows from the inequality for complement set $\overline{\nu}^{01}(A^c) \leq \overline{\nu}^{00}(A^c)$.

The second chain of inequalities can be derived in an analogous manner from the equality

$$S_{x,I}^{11}(A) = \int_{1-}^x \frac{1}{t} dS_{t,I}^{10}(A).$$

Theorem 2 is proved.

Proof of Theorem 3. Consider now the sets of multiples $\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)$. If $A = \{a\}$, $B = \{b\}$ we shall write $\mathcal{M}(A, B|q) = \mathcal{M}(a, b|q)$. For natural numbers a, b with $(a, b) > 1$ or $(ab, q) > 1$ we have $\mathcal{M}(a, b|q) = \emptyset$. Let $a \perp b$ and $ab \perp q$. Then using the notation (2)

$$S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(a, b|q)) = a^{-r_1} b^{-r_2} S_{b^{-1}x, ba^{-1}I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{q,a,b}).$$

After examining the asymptotics of Lemma we conclude that under conditions of Theorem 3 for λ_i

$$S_{b^{-1}x, ba^{-1}I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{q,a,b}) \sim a^{r_1-1} b^{r_2-1} S_{x,I}^{r_1 r_2}(\mathbb{Q}_{q,a,b}), \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

From the Corollary we obtain

$$\nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(a, b|q)) \rightarrow \frac{1}{ab} \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right) \prod_{p|ab} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right), \quad x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (9)$$

Let now A, B be two finite sets. By the sieve arguments we have

$$\nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)) = \sum_{\substack{C \subset A \times B \\ C \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|C|+1} \nu_x^{r_1 r_2} \left(\bigcap_{\langle a, b \rangle \in C} \mathcal{M}(a, b|q) \right). \quad (10)$$

For $C = \{\langle a_1, b_1 \rangle, \langle a_2, b_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle a_{|C|}, b_{|C|} \rangle\} \subset A \times B$ let us introduce the notations

$$[C]_A = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|C|}], \quad [C]_B = [b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{|C|}],$$

here [...] stands for the least common multiples of numbers in the brackets. Then clearly

$$\bigcap_{\langle a, b \rangle \in C} \mathcal{M}(a, b|q) = \mathcal{M}([C]_A, [C]_B|q).$$

Due to (9) all the summands in (10) tend to their limits as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Hence the statement of Theorem 3 follows.

Proof of Theorem 4. The inequality follows by induction over the number of elements $|A| + |B|$. If $A = \{a\}$, $B = \{b\}$, then either $\nu(\mathcal{M}(a, b|q)) = 0$ or

$$\nu(\mathcal{M}(a, b|q)) = \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right) \frac{1}{ab} \prod_{p|ab} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right). \quad (11)$$

In the first case the inequality is trivial, and in the second one we have

$$1 - \nu(\mathcal{M}(a, b|q)) = 1 - \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right) \prod_{p|ab} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) \geq \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right) \left(1 - \prod_{p|ab} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)\right).$$

Let the inequality holds for some finite sets A, B and we add a new number a^* to A . We shall show that the inequality will be satisfied for $\mathcal{M}(A^*, B|q)$ with $A^* = A \cup \{a^*\}$, too. Let us introduce the

following notations: $[a^*, A] = \{[a^*, a] : a \in A\}$, $]a^*, A[= \{a/(a, a^*) : a \in A\}$, where $[a^*, a]$ denotes the least common multiple of numbers in brackets; if C is some finite set of numbers, then $[C]$ stands for the least common multiple of all elements of C . We start with

$$\mathcal{M}(A^*, B|q) = \mathcal{M}(A, B|q) \cup (\mathcal{M}(A^*, B|q) \setminus \mathcal{M}(A, B|q)).$$

Denote briefly $\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)^* = \mathcal{M}(A^*, B|q) \setminus \mathcal{M}(A, B|q)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\mathcal{M}(A^*, B|q)) &= \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)) + \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)^*), \\ \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)^*) &= \nu(\mathcal{M}(a^*, B|q)) - \nu(\mathcal{M}([a^*, A], B|q)). \end{aligned}$$

Using the sieve arguments and the properties of A one derives

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\mathcal{M}(a^*, B|q)) &= \sum_{\substack{C \subseteq B \\ C \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{1+|C|} \nu(\mathcal{M}(a^*, [C]|q)) = \frac{1}{a^*} \prod_{p|a^*} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) \nu(\mathcal{M}(1, B|q)), \\ \nu(\mathcal{M}([a^*, A], B|q)) &= \sum_{\substack{C \subseteq [a^*, A] \times B \\ C \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{1+|C|} \nu(\mathcal{M}([C]_{[a^*, A]}, [C]_B|q)) \\ &= \frac{1}{a^*} \prod_{p|a^*} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) \nu(\mathcal{M}(]a^*, A[, B|q)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows now from this that

$$\nu(\mathcal{M}(A^*, B|q)) = \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)) + \frac{1}{a^*} \prod_{p|a^*} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) (\nu(\mathcal{M}(1, B|q)) - \nu(\mathcal{M}(]a^*, A[, B|q))).$$

Because of $\nu(\mathcal{M}(1, B|q)) \leq 1$ and $\nu(\mathcal{M}(]a^*, A[, B|q)) \geq \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q))$ we obtain

$$1 - \nu(\mathcal{M}(A^*, B|q)) \geq 1 - \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)) - \frac{1}{a^*} \prod_{p|a^*} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) (1 - \nu(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q))),$$

and the inequality for the sets A^*, B follows. If instead of A we add a new element to B , the arguments proving the inequality would be essentially the same. The Theorem is proved.

Proof of Theorem 5. Recall that for $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $\mathcal{M}(A)$ the set of multiples of elements $a \in A$. If $N > 1$ let $A_N = A \cap [1; N]$.

We start with the equality

$$\nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q)) = \nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(A_N, B_N|q)) + \nu_x^{r_1 r_2}(\mathcal{M}(A, B|q) \setminus \mathcal{M}(A_N, B_N|q)). \quad (12)$$

It suffices to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$ the upper limit of the second term in (12) is less than ϵ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, supposed that N is large enough. Define two subsets of rational numbers

$$\mathcal{M}_N^1 = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} : m \in \mathcal{M}(A) \setminus \mathcal{M}(A_N) \right\}, \quad \mathcal{M}_N^2 = \left\{ \frac{m}{n} : n \in \mathcal{M}(B) \setminus \mathcal{M}(B_N) \right\}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{M}(A, B|q) \setminus \mathcal{M}(A_N, B_N|q) \subset \mathcal{M}_N^1 \cup \mathcal{M}_N^2.$$

We are going to prove that for fixed $\delta > 0$ and N sufficiently large we shall have $\overline{\nu}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^i) \leq \delta$ for $i = 1, 2$. Denote for the sake of brevity $\mathcal{M}(A)_N = \mathcal{M}(A) \setminus \mathcal{M}(A_N)$, $\mathcal{M}(B)_N = \mathcal{M}(B) \setminus \mathcal{M}(B_N)$. Then

$$S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^2) \leq \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{M}(B)_N}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\lambda_1 n < m < \lambda_2 n} \frac{1}{m}.$$

Let $\lambda_1 = 0$ first. With some constant $c > 0$ we have

$$S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^2) \leq (\log(\lambda_2 x) + c) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{M}(B)_N}} \frac{1}{n}.$$

The Erdős-Davenport statement as formulated in the Theorem 1 implies that there exists some vanishing sequence δ_N such that $\bar{\nu}^1(\mathcal{M}(B)_N) < \delta_N$. It follows then that for x a sufficiently large we shall have

$$S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^2) \leq \delta_N \log x (\log(\lambda_2 x) + c).$$

Compare now the functions on the right-side of this inequality to that ones in the asymptotics of $S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathbb{Q}^+)$ (see Lemma):

$$S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^2) \leq \begin{cases} \log^2(\lambda_2 x) \left\{ \delta_N \frac{\log x}{\log(\lambda_2 x)} + \frac{\delta_N c \log x}{\log^2(\lambda_2 x)} \right\}, \\ \log x \cdot \log(\lambda_2^2 x) \left\{ \delta_N \frac{\log(\lambda_2 x)}{\log(\lambda_2^2 x)} + \frac{\delta_N c}{\log(\lambda_2^2 x)} \right\}. \end{cases}$$

Having in mind the conditions on λ_i we conclude that $\bar{\nu}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^2) \leq \delta$ for N large enough.

We shall show now that $\bar{\nu}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1) \leq \delta$ as well. If $m/n < \lambda_2$ and $n \leq x$, then $m \leq \lambda_2 x$ and $n > m/\lambda_2$. We start with

$$S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1) \leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq \lambda_2 \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{m/\lambda_2 < n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} + \sum_{\substack{\lambda_2 < m \leq \lambda_2 x \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{m/\lambda_2 < n \leq x} \frac{1}{n}.$$

Consider the first summand. Using the Erdős-Davenport theorem as above we obtain that for x large enough

$$\sum_{\substack{m \leq \lambda_2 \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{m/\lambda_2 < n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} \leq (\log x + c) \sum_{\substack{m \leq \lambda_2 \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \leq \delta_N (\log x + c) \log \lambda_2.$$

where $\delta_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Using similar arguments for the second sum we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1) &\leq \delta_N (\log x + c) \log \lambda_2 + \sum_{\substack{\lambda_2 < m \leq \lambda_2 x \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2 x}{m} \right) + c \frac{\lambda_2}{m} \right\} \\ &\leq \delta_N (\log x + c) \log \lambda_2 + \log x \sum_{\substack{m \leq \lambda_2 x \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} + c \lambda_2 \sum_{m > \lambda_2} \frac{1}{m^2} \leq \delta_N \log x \log(\lambda_2 x) + c_1, \quad c_1 > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and $\bar{\nu}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1) \leq \delta$. This completes the proof in the case $\lambda_1 = 0$.

Let now $\lambda_1 > 0$. Then using the Erdős-Davenport theorem again we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^2) &\leq \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{M}(B)_N}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\lambda_1 n < m < \lambda_2 n} \frac{1}{m} \leq \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{M}(B)_N}} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 n} \right\} \\ &\leq \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) \log x \left(\delta_N + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 \log(\lambda_2/\lambda_1) \log x} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that under conditions on λ_1, λ_2

$$\lambda_1 \log(\lambda_2/\lambda_1) \log x = \lambda_1 \log(\lambda_2 + 2) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\log(\lambda_2 + 2)} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) \log x \right) \rightarrow \infty,$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently $\overline{\nu}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^2) \leq \delta$.

For $S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1)$ we proceed as follows:

$$S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1) \leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq \lambda_2 \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{n < m/\lambda_1} \frac{1}{n} + \sum_{\substack{\lambda_2 < m \leq \lambda_2 x \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \sum_{m/\lambda_2 < n < m/\lambda_1} \frac{1}{n}. \quad (13)$$

If λ_2 remains bounded, then the first sum in (13) is zero for N sufficiently large. Otherwise we have

$$\sum_{\substack{m \leq \lambda_2 \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{n < m/\lambda_1} \frac{1}{n} \leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq \lambda_2 \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) + c \right\} \leq \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) \log x \left\{ \delta_N \frac{\log \lambda_2}{\log x} + \delta_N \frac{c \log \lambda_2}{\log(\lambda_2/\lambda_1) \log x} \right\}.$$

For the second sum in (13) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_2 < m \leq \lambda_2 x \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{m/\lambda_2 < n < m/\lambda_1} \frac{1}{n} &\leq \sum_{\substack{\lambda_2 < m \leq \lambda_2 x \\ m \in \mathcal{M}(A)_N}} \frac{1}{m} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) + c \frac{\lambda_2}{m} \right\} \leq \delta_N \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) \log(\lambda_2 x) + c \\ &\leq \log \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right) \log x \left\{ \delta_N \frac{\log(\lambda_2 x)}{\log x} + \delta_N \frac{c}{\log(\lambda_2/\lambda_1) \log x} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from both estimates that for given $\delta > 0$ under conditions on λ_i we shall have $S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1) \leq \delta S_{x,I}^{11}(\mathbb{Q}^+)$, supposed x, N are large enough. Hence $\overline{\nu}^{11}(\mathcal{M}_N^1) \leq \delta$, and the proof of theorem is completed.

References

- [1] A.S. Besicovitch, On the density of certain sequences of integers, *Mathematische Annalen*, **110**., 336–341, 1934.
- [2] H. Davenport and P. Erdős, On sequences of positive integers, *Acta Arithmetica*, **2**:147–151, 1937.
- [3] H. Davenport and P. Erdős, On sequences of positive integers, *J. Indian Math. Soc.*(2), **15**:19–24, 1951.
- [4] R.L. Graham and D.E. Knuth and O. Potashnik, *Concrete mathematics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1994.
- [5] H. Halberstam and K.F. Roth, *Sequences*, Oxford University Press, 1966.
- [6] R.R. Hall, *Sets of multiples*, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [7] H. Heilbronn, On the inequality in the elementary theory of numbers, *Proc. Camb. Phil.Soc.*, **33**:207–209, 1937.
- [8] H. Rohrbach, Beweis einer zahlentheoretischer Ungleichung, *J. Reine. Angew. Math.*, **177**:193–196, 1937.
- [9] V. Stakėnas, On the Multiples, A. Laurinćikas and E. Manstavičius, *Analytic and Probabilistic Methods in Number Theory. Proc. of the 4th Intern. Conference in Honour of J. Kubilius, Palanga, Lithuania, 25-29 September, 2006*, TEV, Vilnius, 2007, pp. 213–224.